



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

manuscript seems free from the influence of Theodotion, Origen, and the later editions. On the other hand it is going to give us a clearer insight into the amount and kind of corruption which preceded Origen.

HENRY A. SANDERS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
ANN ARBOR, MICH.

### CEPHAS AND PETER IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

In his note 'Simon, Cephas, Peter' in this *Review* (January, 1921, pp. 95-97), Professor Kirsopp Lake, calling attention to the existence of early evidence that in some quarters Cephas was thought to be a different person from Peter, wonders why "Christian tradition has so completely lost sight of these doubts, which were clearly present in various forms to Clement of Alexandria and to the still earlier writer of the *Epistola Apostolorum*."

As a matter of fact Christian tradition never lost sight completely of these doubts. This was due primarily to controversial reasons which led the expositors of the New Testament to attempt edifying explanations of the quarrel of Cephas and Paul at Antioch related in the Epistle to the Galatians. It seems that very early dissenters from the great church made the most of that episode to belittle the value of the unity and consistency of the Apostolic tradition boasted by the *καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*. Of the Marcionites, for instance, Tertulian says: "Proponunt ergo ad suggillandum ignorantiam aliquam apostolorum, quod Petrus et qui cum eo reprehensi sunt a Paulo . . ." etc. (*De praescr. haeret.* 23), and again: "Ipsium Petrum caeterosque columnas apostolatus a Paulo reprehensos opponunt, quod non recto pede incederent ad Evangelii veritatem" (*Adv. Marcionem*, i, 20; iv, 3; v, 3). It seems that Porphyry also made caustic comments on the apostolic quarrel: "Porphyrio . . . blasphemanti, qui Pauli arguit procacitatem, quod principem Apostolorum Petrum ausus est reprehendere et arguere in faciem . . ." (Jerome, Ep. cxii, 6, ad Augustinum); and finally the emperor Julian accused Peter of hypocrisy: *κατασκώπτει δὲ πρὸς τοῦτοις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἔκκριτον Πέτρον ὁ γεννάδας καὶ ὑποκριτὴν εἰναί φησι, καὶ ἐλληλέγχθαι διὰ τοῦ Παύλου, ὥς ποτε μὲν τοῖς Ἑλλήνων ἔθεισι διαζῆν σπουδάζοντα, ποτὲ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίων, ἡννοηκῶς εἰσάπαν τὴν ἐν γε τοῦτοις εὐτεχεστάτην οἰκονομίαν* (Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum*, lib. ix. P. G. lxxvi, 1000-01).

The passage of Clement's *Hypotyposeon* quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* i. 12, 2) states that the Cephas who was rebuked by Paul in Antioch was not Peter, but one of the Seventy Disciples. It seems therefore that Clement was following a different tradition from that represented by the *Epistola Apostolorum* and by the so-called Kirchen-Ordnung, both of which make Cephas one of the Twelve, but other than Peter.<sup>1</sup> We must not forget, however, that Eusebius's quotation from the *Hypotyposeon* is not beyond doubt, in view of the fact that according to Rufinus (*Apol. pro Origene*) and Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 109, p. 9, P.G. ciii, 383) this book had been interpolated by heretics of all kinds. This doubt is strengthened by the fact that Origen, who belongs to the same circle with Clement, ignores the tradition that counted Cephas as an independent member of the Twelve, and identifies him with Peter (*Comm. in Joann.* xxxii, 5. P. G. xiv, 753). According to Jerome, Origen was the first to propound the theory that the dispute of Peter and Paul in Antioch was *κατὰ πρόσωπον*—it was an "*honesta dispensatio*," that is to say a preconcerted plot between the two Apostles in order to give a forceful lesson to the Judaizers of Antioch: "Hanc explanationem primus Origenes in decimo Stromatum libro ubi Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas interpretatur et caeteri deinceps interpretes sunt secuti" (*Ep.* cxii. 5). Among those who followed Origen, Jerome expressly mentions "Didymum videntem meum,<sup>2</sup> et Laodicenum de ecclesia nuper expressum (Apollinaris) et Alexandrum veterem haeticum, Eusebium quoque Emisenum, et Theodorum Heracleotem" (*Ep.* cxii, 4). But the most famous of all those who adopted Origen's view was John Chrysostom, who in a sermon on the passage *κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν* (Gal. 2, 11) mentions that there were some who taught that the man rebuked by Paul was not Peter, the first of the Apostles, but somebody else: *Οὐκ ἦν οὗτος Πέτρος, φησίν, ἐκεῖνος ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων πρῶτος, ὁ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τὰ πρόβατα πιστευθεῖς, ἀλλ' ἕτερός τις εὐτελής*

<sup>1</sup> The list of the Apostles given in the *Epistola Apostolorum* and in the Kirchen-Ordnung is certainly curious. It is fair to say, however, that almost all the traditional lists found in various periods and various places present very strange combinations. The main tendency was to preserve the number Twelve, but at the same time to include in the Twelve Paul and the Evangelists. In the iconographic tradition of the sixth century (Theodoricus' Mausoleum) the list is as follows: Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Mark, Luke, Thomas, Simeon, and the same list although in different order appears in the *Ἐρμηνεία τῶν Ζωγράφων* which was for centuries the source book of painters and artists. See G. de Jerphanion, *Quels sont les douze Apôtres dans l'Iconographie chrétienne?* in *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, Sept.-Dec., 1920, pp. 358-367.

<sup>2</sup> A play on "Didymus the Blind."

καὶ ἀπερριμμένος, καὶ τῶν πολλῶν εἰς (P. G. li, 380). As for himself Chrysostom rejects this opinion and affirms the identity of Cephas and Peter.

It is worthy of remark in this passage from Chrysostom that, according to the theologians whose opinion he criticizes, Cephas was a despicable person; the disparaging words *εὐτελὲς καὶ ἀπερριμμένος, καὶ τῶν πολλῶν εἰς* could hardly be applied to one of the Seventy. Had Chrysostom a different source from Eusebius? Neither Chrysostom nor Jerome mentions the names of those who, following Clement's view, denied the identity of Cephas and Peter; but from Jerome's words it is clear that at least one of those who had written extensive replies to Porphyry adopted this opinion: "Ad extremum si propter Porphyrii blasphemiam alius nobis fingendus est Cephas, ne Petrus putetur errasse, infinita de scripturis erunt radenda divinis, quae ille qui non intelligit criminatur" (*Comm. in Gal.*, P. L. xxvi, 341). Was he aiming at Methodius of Olympus or at Eusebius of Caesarea, both of whom are known to have written treatises against Porphyry? This question cannot be settled, because both those works are completely lost.

In the pre-Nicene Christian literature of the West there is no hint of the slightest doubt about the identity of Peter with the man who quarreled with Paul in Antioch. The fact that in the current Latin versions of the New Testament the name Cephas was always translated by Peter prevented any question on this point. As a matter of fact, Tertullian (in the passage quoted above) and Cyprian never name Cephas, and explain Peter's conduct as a remarkable example of concord and patience given to the hierarchy: "Petrus . . . documentum nobis concordiae et patientiae tribuens. . ." (*Ep.* lxxi, ed. Hartel III, ii, 773). Origen's bold exegesis of the *κατὰ πρόσωπον* was unknown in the West. Hilary of Poitiers (*in Ep. ad Gal.*, Pitra, *Spicilegium* i, 58-59) and Ambrose (*in Ep. ad Corinthios* i, 5, 4 and *in Ep. ad Gal.* ii, 11, P. L. xvii, 229, 350) follow Cyprian's line of thought. Jerome was the first who tried to introduce the interpretation of the "*honesta dispensatio*" in the West, but Augustine emphatically opposed an exegesis which made of the dispute of the apostles a little pious comedy for the instruction of the Judaisers of Antioch. This question led to an exchange of somewhat sharp letters between Jerome and Augustine, written not without *rancore stomachi*, as the former himself says. Augustine's view eventually prevailed, and Jerome later on recanted (*Adv. Rufinum*, 3, 1. See Möhler, *Gesammelte Schriften* i, 1 ff.).

Augustine does not mention Cephas, but he confesses that his sources of information about the dispute of the Apostles were limited, "haud plures de hoc argumento legi et audiui Patres quam Ambrosium et Cyprianum." Jerome as we have already noticed was acquainted with the opinion that Cephas was not Peter: "Sunt qui Cepham cui hic in faciem Paulus restitisse se scribit, non putant apostolum Petrum, sed alium de septuaginta discipulis isto vocabulo nuncupari. . . . Quibus respondendum, alterius nescio cuius Cephae nescire nos nomen, nisi eius qui et in Evangelio et in aliis Pauli epistulis et in hac quoque ipsa, modo Cephas modo Petrus scribitur" (*Comm. ad Gal.*, P. L. xxvi, 341).

Two centuries later, Gregory the Great in his Commentary on Ezekiel repeats the same statement: "Sunt vero nonnulli qui non Petrum Apostolorum principem, sed quondam alium eo nomine qui a Paulo sit reprehensus accipiunt, qui si Pauli studiosius verba legisent, ista non dicerent" (*In Ezech.* Lib. ii, Hom. vi, 10, P. L. lxxvi, 1003). We have no evidence that in Gregory's times there were Western expositors who held such an opinion; it is probable therefore that Gregory was simply repeating what he read in Jerome. In the East, on the contrary, it seems that about that time the Clementine-Eusebian view was very much in favor; it is explicitly stated in the so-called *Chronica Alexandrina*, or *Chronichon Paschale*, a compilation made under the Emperor Heraclius (610-641) by putting together old lists and documents of various origin. According to the *Chronica*, the Cephas rebuked by Paul was one of the Seventy Disciples: Κηφᾶς ὁ μὲν Πέτρον ὃ καὶ ἐμαχῆσατο Παῦλος κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ (P. G. xcii, 521). The same statement is made in the famous *Σύγγραμμα ἐκκλησιαστικόν*, a forgery of the eighth century published under the name of a Dorotheus, supposed bishop of Tyre and martyr of an early persecution, a mythical personage who never existed. The purpose of the forgery, which purported to be an account of the careers of the Apostles and of the disciples of Jesus, was to give an historical color to the legend of the apostolic foundation of the See of Constantinople, with the apostle Andrew as first bishop. This choice seems to have been suggested by the fact that Andrew was called by Jesus to the apostleship earlier than his brother Peter. In the distribution of churches made by the *Σύγγραμμα*, Cephas also got a bishopric: Κηφᾶς ὃν ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἤλεγξεν ὃς καὶ ἐπίσκοπος Κορίας ἐγένετο (P. G. xcii, 1065).

In the tenth century we find again a commentator on the Epistle to the Galatians, Oecumenius bishop of Triikka (Thessaly), who agrees

with this tradition and quotes Eusebius in support of his opinion (P. G. cxviii, 1112).<sup>3</sup> The same tradition has the adhesion of Salomon Chalatensis, Bishop of Bassara (Syria), in a treatise, "De praedicatione Apostolorum et de loco uniuscuiusque eorum, deque eorum morte," written about 1222 (Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, iii, 319). Finally it found its way into the Greek Menologia, and acquired right of citizenship in the eastern ecclesiastical tradition.<sup>4</sup>

In the West, as it is easy to imagine, Augustine's teaching prevailed, and was constantly followed down to the fifteenth century. It is only occasionally that the opinion that Cephias and Peter were different persons is mentioned, and then only to be rejected. Such is the case with a commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians written by Hervé, abbot of Bourgdieu (Herverus Burdigalensis, 1100-1150), who repeats *ad verbum*, although without quoting the author's name, Gregory in *Ezechielem*: "Sunt vero nonnulli qui non Petrum," etc. (P. L. clxxxi, 1145).

Hugo of St. Victor (*Exegetica*. i. In S. Scrip. Quaestiones in Ep. Pauli in Ep. ad Gal. Quaestio vi.) and after him Aquinas (*Comm. in Ep. ad Galatas*. Opera, ed. Parma, xiii, 396-397) and all the great Scholastics had no doubt of the identity of Cephias and Peter, although they were acquainted through Jerome with the opposite opinion. They discussed at a great length "an (reprehensio haec) fuerit vera, an dispensatoria, et an peccaverit Petrus et vere reprehensibilis fuerit," adding to it a series of considerations "de tempore quo licuit legalia observare et de observatione legalium quantum ad Apostolos," and a detailed exposition of the controversy between Jerome and Augustine, with a conclusion in favor of the latter: "Salva reverentia secretorum, Beati Augustini sententiam preferimus" (Hugo of St. Victor, P. L. clxxv, 556).

During the controversies provoked by the Reformation the dispute at Antioch acquired a new importance in relation to the question of the primacy of Peter.<sup>5</sup> Some Catholic theologians, like those

<sup>3</sup> The writings which go under the name of Oecumenius have rather the character of an anthology compiled in a casual form.

<sup>4</sup> In the Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum the commemoration of Cephias is assigned to December 8 together with other disciples (Propylaeum ad Acta SS. Novembris Synax. Eccl. Cplitanae, opera et studio H. Delehaye. Bruxellis, 1902, col. 290). In the *Menaea* edited in Venice in 1592, the commemoration is found March 30 (*Ib.* col. 574).

<sup>5</sup> On the importance given by the early Protestants to the incident of Antioch, see K. Holl, 'Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus zu Antiochien in seiner Bedeutung für Luthers innere Entwicklung,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxviii (1919), pp. 23-40.

of the fourth century of whom Jerome speaks, thought that the best way to dispose of the question for good and all was to exhume the old opinion of Clement and Eusebius: Cephias was not Peter, but one of the Seventy. (A. Pighe, *Hierarchiae Ecclesiasticae Assertio*. Coloniae 1538. Lib. iii, Cap. 11, f. 100. "Quae ex Paulo obijciuntur, dissolvere." Hardouin, *Commentarius in Novo Testamento*, Amsterdam, 1741, Appendix: Petrus et Joannes vindicati. i. Cepham a Paulo reprehensum Petrum non esse, pp. 785-799).<sup>6</sup> Suarez (Lib. ix, *De lege Divina*, c. 20. Opera, vi, 530-542) and Bellarmine however, remain faithful to the Augustinian view (*De Rom. Pont.* i, cap. xvi. Op. i, 347).

Most theologians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries followed Pighe and Hardouin, and tried to strengthen their assumption not only by making appeal to the old tradition, but also by a long series of historical and theological arguments. (Vallarsi, Notes in his edition of the Opera S. Hieronymi, Venice 1766-72, vii, 408 seq. reprinted in P. L. xxviii, 340; Zaccaria, *Dissertazione su Cefa ripreso da S. Paolo*: Diss. varie. I, 195; Roma 1780; M. Molkenbuhr, *Quod Cephas Gal. II, 11, non sit Petrus*. Apud Monast., 1803; A. F. James, *Dissertations ou il est irréfragablement prouvé que St. Pierre seul décida la question de foi soumise au Concile de Jérusalem et que Cephas repris par St. Paul à Antioche n'est pas le même que le prince des Apôtres*, Paris 1846; A. Vincenzi, *Lucubrationes biblicae*, Pars ii, 87, et seq.; I. Neubauer S. J., 'De Legibus,' in *Theologia Wirceburgensis*, Tom. v, 258-265.)

The most important of these arguments was furnished by chronol-

<sup>6</sup> Jean Hardouin, Jesuit, was the editor of the "Conciliorum Collectio Regia Maxima" (Paris, 1715-25). His "Commentarius in Novum Testamentum" was published after his death. The appendix "Petrus Vindicatus" is divided into 20 chapters, dealing with the exegetical and the historical sides of the question. The fifth chapter assumes that if we grant that Cephas was Peter, we must conclude that Peter was guilty of heresy: "Immunem ab hereseos labe Petrum non fuisse, si reprehensus ipse a Paulo est." The sixth goes even so far as to affirm that all faith in Scripture would be upset if we admit the identity of Cephas and Peter: "Periclitari ac mutare ipsam sacrarum literarum fidem videri si Petrum a Paulo fuisse reprehensus damus." This excess of zeal led to the condemnation of the *Commentarius*, which was put on the Index. Hardouin was incensed by the fact that not only Protestant historians (like the Centuriatores Magdeburgenses) but also Jansenist writers (like P. Quesnel, *La Discipline de l'Eglise* i, 224-229) put great stress on the incident of Antioch as giving evidence that Peter's (and therefore the Pope's) decisions were far from being unimpeachable. He shows no less irritation against the Greek editions of the New Testament, which like that published in Holland in 1638, for the reading Κηφᾶν in Gal. 2, 11-14, substituted Πέτρον, which reading, he says, "habetur a Graecis (schismaticis) pro authentica."

ogy and had been already sketched by Hardouin. Starting from the theory of the twenty-five years of Roman episcopate of Peter, these theologians concluded that Peter must have been in Rome not later than the year 42 A.D.; on the other hand it was only in the year 44 that Paul went to Jerusalem and there met for the first time Cephas, with whom *junxit dexteram*. This Cephas could not be Peter, who at that time was in Rome. But there is no doubt that the Cephas who five years later in Antioch was rebuked by Paul was the same man that Paul had met in Jerusalem, therefore he cannot be identified with Peter, although about that time Peter returned to Jerusalem, to preside over the council of the year 50.

The Vatican Council of 1870 and the discussions about the infallibility of the Pope gave a new interest to the question. But modern Catholic theologians, realizing how weak is the chronological argument based on legendary data, have abandoned Cephas to his fate, and have gone back to Augustine and the old tradition of the western Fathers. (Palmieri, D., *De Romano Pontifice*, Prati, 1902, pp. 372-73. Mazzella, C., *De Religione et Ecclesia*, Prati, 1905, pp. 692-693. Straub, *De Ecclesia Christi*, i, 135. Innsbruck, 1912.) They accepted the identity of Cephas and Peter, but found in the episode of Antioch a new argument in favor of the infallibility of the Pope: "Huiusmodi facto evidenter se prodit Petri primatus. Quamvis enim Paulus verbis doceret non esse opus iudaizare, Petrus autem solo conversationis exemplo videretur docere esse iudaizandum, hic tamen ceteros ipsumque Barnabam *cogebat*, non tantum alliciebat iudaizare. Unde tanta efficacia exempli taciti Petri, ut praevaleret doctrinae praedican-tis Pauli, nisi ex eo quod ab omnibus Petrus potior Paulo habebatur eiusque auctoritas suprema esse in Ecclesia credebatur?" (Palmieri, *op. cit.* p. 374.)

G. LA PIANA

## A SYRIAC PARALLEL TO THE GOLDEN RULE

Numerous parallels to the Golden Rule of Matt. 7, 12 and Luke 6, 31 have been found in various writers.<sup>1</sup> Most of these are Jewish or Christian, but some of them are far remote in time and place from

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum*, i, pp. 341 f.; A. Resch, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, x (1897), 3, pp. 80 f.; G. Resch, *ibid.*, xxviii (1905), 3, pp. 132 ff.; Heinrici, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, iii (1905), pp. 85 ff.; and Proost, *De Bergrede* (1914), pp. 153 f. To the passages cited in these works may be added the following: *Mahabharata*, xii, 259, 20: Quod quispiam non vult sibi ab aliis